

**Plaintiffs' Administrative  
Motion re: Sanctions  
Redacted Version of  
Document Sought to be Sealed**

**BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP**

David Boies (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
333 Main Street  
Armonk, NY 10504  
Tel: (914) 749-8200  
dboies@bsfllp.com

Mark C. Mao, CA Bar No. 236165  
Beko Reblitz-Richardson, CA Bar No. 238027  
Erika Nyborg-Burch, CA Bar No. 342125  
44 Montgomery St., 41st Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Tel.: (415) 293-6800  
mmao@bsfllp.com  
brichardson@bsfllp.com  
enyborg-burch@bsfllp.com

James Lee (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Rossana Baeza (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
100 SE 2nd St., 28th Floor  
Miami, FL 33131  
Tel.: (305) 539-8400  
jlee@bsfllp.com  
rbaeza@bsfllp.com

Alison L. Anderson, CA Bar No. 275334  
725 S Figueroa St., 31st Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Tel.: (213) 995-5720  
alanderson@bsfllp.com

**SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.**

Bill Carmody (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Shawn J. Rabin (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Steven M. Shepard (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Alexander Frawley (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor  
New York, NY 10019  
Tel.: (212) 336-8330  
bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com  
srabin@susmangodfrey.com  
sshepard@susmangodfrey.com  
afrawley@susmangodfrey.com

Amanda K. Bonn, CA Bar No. 270891  
1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Tel.: (310) 789-3100  
abonn@susmangodfrey.com

**MORGAN & MORGAN**

John A. Yanchunis (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Ryan J. McGee (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor  
Tampa, FL 33602  
Tel.: (813) 223-5505  
jyanchunis@forthepeople.com  
rmcgee@forthepeople.com

Michael F. Ram, CA Bar No. 104805  
711 Van Ness Ave, Suite 500  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Tel: (415) 358-6913  
mram@forthepeople.com

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,  
JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER  
CASTILLO, and MONIQUE TRUJILLO  
individually and on behalf of all similarly  
situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No.: 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

**PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION REGARDING COURT'S  
MAY 20, 2022 ORDER**

**CIVIL L.R. 7-11**

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-11, Plaintiffs respectfully seek permission from the Court for limited further briefing regarding Google's response to the Court's sanctions order (Dkts. 588, 593-3) (the "Sanctions Order"),<sup>1</sup> which demonstrates additional misconduct by Google that continues to prejudice Plaintiffs.

This motion stems from a declaration that Google served on June 14, 2022, where Google employee Martin Sramek identified [REDACTED] additional logs that contain Incognito detection bits. A true and correct copy of Mr. Sramek's June 14 declaration is attached to the concurrently filed Mao Declaration as **Exhibit A** (the "June 14 Sramek Decl."). Google served this declaration pursuant to the Court's Sanctions Order, which required Google to "provide Plaintiffs with a representation in writing no later than **May 31, 2022** that other than the logs identified thus far as containing Incognito-detection bits, no other such logs exist." Dkt. 593-3 at 6 (emphasis in original).

Google did not meet that deadline. Instead, on May 31, 2022, Google served a declaration (also from Mr. Sramek) stating that Google's investigation started on May 23 was "ongoing," and that it would take another two weeks. A true and correct copy of Mr. Sramek's May 31, 2022 Declaration is attached to the concurrently filed Mao Declaration as **Exhibit B** (the "May 31 Sramek Decl."); *id.* ¶ 5. Prior to sending this declaration, Google did not ask the Court or Plaintiffs for any extension. Google also did not attempt to justify why it needed an extension to investigate the existence of logs that Plaintiffs have been seeking to identify for many months, and that the Court specially inquired about during the April 21, 2022 Sanctions hearing (where Google could not provide a straightforward response). Instead, Google granted itself a two-week extension, and then *provided the June 14 declaration after Plaintiffs served their final expert reports.*

Google should have disclosed these logs containing the Incognito detection bits many months ago, including in response to this Court's initial Order to Show Cause Why Google Should Not be Sanctioned for Discovery Misconduct ("Order to Show Cause"). As a result of Google's failure to disclose these Incognito detection bits and the logs in which they exist sooner,

---

<sup>1</sup> On May 31, 2022, the parties filed a joint submission regarding sealing portions of the Sanctions Order, which had a public version of the Sanctions Order with proposed redactions. Dkt. 593. Accordingly, Plaintiffs will refer to the publicly-available information revealed in Dkt. 593-3.

1 compounded by Google's self-granted extension, Plaintiffs were unable to obtain discovery  
 2 regarding these additional logs or even note their existence in Plaintiffs' final expert reports, which  
 3 were served on June 7, 2022. Dkt. 581.

4 According to Mr. Sramek's June 14 Declaration, the [REDACTED] *additional* logs (above and beyond  
 5 the [REDACTED] logs that Plaintiffs and the Court knew about as of the April 21, 2022 Sanctions hearing)  
 6 that contain Incognito-detection bits also:

- 7 1. "[C]ontain data regarding users' interactions with ads related to third-party exchanges"  
 8 (June 14 Sramek Decl. ¶ 11);
- 9 2. Support Google's "analysis and modeling to predict ad revenues" (*id.* ¶ 6);
- 10 3. Are "currently used for analysis and testing" (*id.* ¶ 7); and
- 11 4. "[C]ontain information in personal logs, which were not previously disclosed by  
 12 Google, joined with information contained in query state logs" (*id.* ¶ 9).

13 Google also disclosed an additional [REDACTED] log containing these Incognito-detection bits,  
 14 but Google did not provide any substantive description of the data contained in that log or the  
 15 identifiers used with that log. *Id.* ¶ 12.

16 Google also still has not complied with the Court's requirement that Google "provide  
 17 Plaintiffs with a representation in writing . . . that . . . no other logs exist." Dkt. 593-3 at 6.

18 Google's belated disclosure of these additional data sources (and continuing refusal to  
 19 represent that no other logs exist) has prejudiced Plaintiffs, and Plaintiffs respectfully request an  
 20 opportunity to submit very short additional briefing for the Court on these issues. Plaintiffs wish  
 21 to seek additional sanctions pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37, including preclusion  
 22 and issue sanctions, jury instructions, and monetary sanctions.

23 Plaintiffs request that the Court set a briefing schedule on an expedited track:

<u>Pleading</u>	<u>Page Limit</u>	<u>Due Date</u>
Plaintiffs' Motion and Memorandum	8	July 1, 2022
Google's Opposition	8	July 8, 2022
Plaintiffs' Reply	5	July 15, 2022

Google has informed Plaintiffs that it is not opposed to additional briefing on these issues, but Google stated that any additional briefing in July would cause Google “to oppose the briefing schedule and/or seek to push the class cert briefing and expert discovery deadlines back.” Mao Decl. ¶ 3. Plaintiffs have worked extremely hard to meet the class certification and expert discovery deadlines, and Google’s additional discovery misconduct should not provide any basis for Google to now seek to modify any of those deadlines. Google should not be permitted to complain about timing when the timeframe is entirely attributable to Google’s misconduct. Had Google disclosed these additional [REDACTED] logs when Plaintiffs first uncovered the Incognito detection bits, the parties would have already briefed their import and there would no need for additional briefing. Google’s delay and obstruction has already prejudiced Plaintiffs, and it is improper for Google use that same delay and obstruction to delay any imposition of additional sanctions or obtain more time for Google’s opposition to Plaintiffs’ class certification motion.

Dated: June 23, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/Mark Mao

Mark C. Mao (CA Bar No. 236165)  
mmao@bsflp.com  
Beko Reblitz-Richardson (CA Bar No. 238027)  
brichardson@bsflp.com  
Erika Nyborg-Burch (*pro hac vice*)  
Enyborg-burch@bsflp.com  
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP  
44 Montgomery Street, 41<sup>st</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 293 6858  
Facsimile (415) 999 9695

James W. Lee (*pro hac vice*)  
jlee@bsflp.com  
Rossana Baeza (*pro hac vice*)  
rbaeza@bsflp.com  
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP  
100 SE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Suite 2800  
Miami, FL 33130  
Telephone: (305) 539-8400  
Facsimile: (305) 539-1304

1 Bill Carmody (*pro hac vice*)  
bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com  
2 Shawn J. Rabin (*pro hac vice*)  
srabin@susmangodfrey.com  
3 Steven Shepard (*pro hac vice*)  
sshepard@susmangodfrey.com  
4 Alexander P. Frawley (*pro hac vice*)  
afrawley@susmangodfrey.com  
5 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
6 New York, NY 10019  
Telephone: (212) 336-8330  
7

8 Amanda Bonn (CA Bar No. 270891)  
abonn@susmangodfrey.com  
9 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
10 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Telephone: (310) 789-3100  
11

12 John A. Yanchunis (*pro hac vice*)  
jyanchunis@forthepeople.com  
13 Ryan J. McGee (*pro hac vice*)  
rmcgee@forthepeople.com  
14 MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.  
201 N Franklin Street, 7th Floor  
15 Tampa, FL 33602  
Telephone: (813) 223-5505  
16 Facsimile: (813) 222-4736  
17

18 Michael F. Ram, CA Bar No. 104805  
MORGAN & MORGAN  
19 711 Van Ness Ave, Suite 500  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
20 Tel: (415) 358-6913  
mram@forthepeople.com  
21

22 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28